

## Sharon Omstead

---

**From:** Sharon Omstead  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2016 8:35 AM  
**To:** Brad Vannocker; David Yearout; Derek Belton; Dwight Flaming; Jeff Bina; Jim Schmidt; Kathy Inlow; Marty Dalke; Mary Avery; Nick Kraus  
**Subject:** FW: Amendment Proposal

Please see message below from Rex Savage

**From:** Rex and Carolyn Savage [mailto:rcjr1980@fhrd.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 11:24 PM  
**To:** Sharon Omstead <SOmstead@marioncoks.net>  
**Subject:** Re: Amendment Proposal

Sharon and Emma:

I plan on being at the meeting tonight (Thurs), but as you know, life has gotten complex for my family this week. I would like to offer the following comments for the committee's consideration as relevant to their discussions.

As discussed at last month's meeting, each new turbine model seems to bring longer rotor blades, which offer higher gross and net capacity factors and better economics. For a wind farm to be constructed in Marion County, the minimum ground clearance must be dropped from its current 100' AGL standard specified in 27-107 #6. I would opine that was an arbitrary number when it was selected for Marion County regulations many years ago, and which has since been outmoded by ever improving blade design and construction. The highest number to accommodate the new Siemens 120m rotor on a 80m hub height installation would be 60' AGL, and frankly, I would bet on that being obsolete in a year or two. I would strongly recommend adoption of no higher than 50' AGL as the new standard. Frankly, anything over 25' offers no additional safety consideration that I can see.

My second comment regards section 27-108, currently titled "Power Purchase Agreement". This could simply be retitled "Power Marketing Plan" and it should not interfere with development in any logical way. However, in pure form, this is an economic issue, not a land use issue. If the Committee decides to drop references to power sales, the balance of this section must be retitled or amended into another section so as to infringe on rights now vested in our existing C.U.P.s. The "Section Outline" segment at the start of the entire document incorrectly identifies this portion as 27-109, these should be matched up.

Thanks!

Rex